

l
c
y
r
a
e
f
-
n
l
a
e
f
t
t
a
t

I
t
n
t
v
t
in
o
S
et
o
th
se
sh
u
si
E
P
C
pu
ac
ar
an

A LETTER

TO THE

MEMBERS OF THE UNITED CHURCH OF ENGLAND
AND IRELAND,

IN THE TOWNSHIP OF SCARBOROUGH.

MY DEAR FRIENDS,

Although the pastoral relation that once existed between us has been long severed, yet I still feel an interest in the spiritual welfare of those among whom I once ministered; and when I find that your present minister, in a letter to you, charges me with circulating "many very erroneous and strange doctrines, contrary to God's word and the teachings of his Church," and "feels himself called upon to endeavour, according to his ability, to banish and drive them away from among you, according to his solemn promise made at ordination"—I under at least an equal sense of my ordination vows must, while maintaining the gospel doctrines of the Reformation as taught by our beloved Church, endeavour to free myself from so serious a charge; and this I rejoice to say, as you yourselves shall judge, will be a very easy matter. Of Mr. Darling, personally, I wish to entertain no other feelings but those of kindness and christian brotherhood. Whatever there may be in the ensuing letter that is painful, let it be imputed to the unhappy system which Mr. Darling has espoused. Popery moulds and uses its instruments, as best suits its own purposes, and too often themselves are unconscious of the very fact.

I first wish to draw your attention to the general scope of the Pastoral Letter. Mr. Darling, mind you, does not endeavour to prove the truth or falsity of the doctrines and practices in question by the unerring standard of God's most holy word, but strives to show that the prayer book affords him some ground for the maintenance of his views, he urges you, in the last paragraph of his letter, "to reject all teachings and opinions which are plainly contrary to those contained in the prayer book." Now in this he opposes the very rule of faith of our Church, which, according to her sixth article, is this: "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that *whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby*, is not to be required of any man, that it shall be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." Now, my friends, you see the Church of England speaks very differently from Mr. Darling; she refers you to the bible, he to the prayer book, which, admirable *upon the whole* as it is, is still the composition of poor, weak, erring, sinful creatures like ourselves. And do remember, the Church of England nowhere leads her people to suppose her infallible (the Popish Church does); she says, in the nineteenth article, "The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments are duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same. As the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, have erred; so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not

only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith. Now from the sixth and nineteenth articles, already quoted, it must be evident to every one that the bible and it alone can be the rule of faith of a Church of England man; that is the only fountain from which we can hope to derive the truth. Using the quaint language of the first homily—"Let us diligently search for the well of life in the books of the Old and New Testament, and not run to the stinking puddles of men's traditions, devised by men's imagination, for our justification and salvation. For in holy scripture is fully contained *what we ought to do*, and what to eschew, *what to believe*, what to love, and what to look to at God's hands at length." But as Mr. Darling has grievously misrepresented our articles and formularies, by giving them a Popish bearing, I will meet him on his own ground; and, as I hope, confirm you in the belief that our church, nourished by the blood of martyred men, who died protesting against the very errors Mr. Darling is endeavouring to pervert you to, has no leaning or kindness to that erroneous and cruel church which slew those very men.

In the first place, the letter is addressed "to the members of the Catholic Church of England." When, my friends, a man professes to write a letter in the English language, we naturally expect that he should use only such words as he knows the meaning of. Now, Mr. Darling either knows the meaning of the word "catholic," or he does not; if he does, which I cannot doubt, he assumes on your supposed ignorance; and if he does not, he assumes on his own ignorance; for the above title is sheer nonsense. The word "catholic," derived from two Greek words, *kata olos*, means *universal*; and universal means *not particular*, but pervading or extending over the whole world, or belonging to something in which every man is concerned; for example, we say the wisdom and power and goodness of God are universal, because in every clime, in every situation, and in every production of the earth we see these qualities displayed. The Church of England, I need not tell you, is the aggregate of many thousands of congregations in England, with offshoots in other places; the whole united and bound together by the thirty-nine articles. Thus we see the Church of England is the church of a peculiar locality. It is *not* the Church of France, it is *not* the Church of Russia, it is *not* the Church of Holland; it is therefore particular, and consequently not universal or catholic. It may be, and indeed *is*, part of Christ's universal church, but you very well know the part of a thing does not constitute the thing itself; in other words, the *part is not the whole*. Mr. Darling's letter is addressed "to the members of the universal particular church." Whether this phrase becomes a man who ought to be a scholar, I leave you to judge. We see that, whatever were the peculiar gifts which Mr. Darling speaks of in page 3 of his Pastoral, as acquired at his ordination, those of writing the English language correctly, and, as we shall presently see, of quoting honestly, were not of the number.

In the letter addressed to you, the subject matter may be divided into an attack upon my principles, as he calls them, and a defence of his own. It would perhaps have been more consistent, in the first place, to have proved, if possible, *his own views from the word of God*, before he had attempted to refute *mine from the prayer book*; such at all events is the teaching of the Church of England, in her articles, homilies, and liturgy. She refers us, in all our doubts, to the Bible.

"But anger has some claim to indulgence, and railing is usually a relief to the mind." Perhaps Mr. Darling has found relief from the experiment. However, let us pass to a review of the Pastoral Letter in question and we shall find seventeen mis-statements and false quotations; and so important are these latter, that they entirely alter the meaning intended to be conveyed. This is a serious charge; but you, yourselves, shall be the judges. That you may be enabled to do so fairly, you must, when reading this, have Mr. Darling's letter at hand, as well as your prayer book, and, if possible, the canons of 1603. The bible you need not heed, as that blessed book is not, I presume, considered of any importance in doctrinal questions. We are not to seek God's teaching, but the church's; at least such I suppose is Mr. Darling's opinion, for in the whole of that gentleman's letter I believe there is only one quotation from it.

Turn, my friends, to the ordination service for priests, in the prayer book; the fourth question asked is, "Will you be ready, with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines, *contrary to God's word.*" Look to the second paragraph on the first page of Mr. Darling's letter; and he says "it" (my letter to the Protestants of Canada) "contains many erroneous and strange doctrines, contrary to God's word and *the teachings of his Church.*" He therefore feels himself called upon to drive them away, according to his solemn promise made at ordination. Now, Mr. Darling, nor any other clergyman of the Church of England, ever made any such promise; the teachings of the church is nowhere mentioned. Read the questions over carefully, and especially the second, "Are you persuaded that the holy scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrine required of necessity for eternal salvation through faith in Jesus Christ? and are you determined, *out of the said scriptures*, to instruct the people committed to your charge, and *to teach nothing* as required of necessity to eternal salvation *but that which you shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by the scriptures.*" It is a pity that Mr. Darling, whose ordination vows are such a conscientious weight upon his mind, had not this one more prominently in his memory when he sat down and wrote his pastoral letter; for I would ask you, my friends, and I appeal to the conscience of each one of you, has Mr. Darling taught you in his letter from scripture, or has he not; and if not, has he fulfilled his ordination promise, of which he speaks so much about.

Let us pass to the first paragraph on the second page of Mr. Darling's letter; and I distinctly state that all that I subscribed to at my ordination I can cordially and *ex animo* subscribe to now, and that "the doctrines (or articles) and formularies which are already in existence, *taken as a whole*, are scriptural, and admirably adapted to the wants and feelings of mankind." I have quoted the preceding from my former letter, as Mr. Darling frequently does so; and as frequently, once excepted, with an omission most important to my meaning. Can this by any possibility be unintentional?

Mr. Darling says it is a church principle, "that there cannot be in any one place more than one branch of the true church, and that the branch of the true church in this land is the United Church of England and Ireland." Where does the church say so? No where. Does the bible say this? Most assuredly not. Only substitute "Popish principle" for "Church principle," and "Church of Rome" for "Church

of England," in the preceding, and it will be correctly worded, according to Mr. Darling's real meaning. But only examine his method of proving his assertion. A few words taken from this, and a few words from that, and a few words from somewhere else, put these together according to the writer's views, and, my friends, the prayer book, or any other book, even the bible, can be made to say any thing or nothing, just as a man pleases; couple with this the most painful mis-statements, and false or garbled quotations; and you have at one view the way the Church of England is made responsible for Mr. Darling's church principles.

But let me not fall into that gentleman's error of asserting without proving; let us examine how he endeavours to prove the assertion quoted in the preceding paragraph. After adducing the nineteenth article, he says: "Now, according to Christ's ordinance, his sacraments must be ministered by lawful bishops, priests, and deacons." Let me ask, where in the bible is it related that Christ made such pretended ordinance. Where does the Church of England say any such thing. Christ, my friends, made no such ordinance. He says, "Do this in remembrance of me;" and "Go ye, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost." But, more than this, Christ makes no mention of bishops, priests, and deacons. Search the word of God, my friends, and see if these things be so. Mr. Darling, continuing his argument, says: "But the Church of England says, no man is a lawful bishop, priest, or deacon, unless ordained by a bishop." The Church of England says no such thing; how can any man assert she does? She says, in the preface to the ordination service, that "No man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful bishop, priest, or deacon, in the *United Church of England and Ireland*, or suffered to execute any of the said functions, except he be called, tried, examined and admitted thereunto, according to the form hereafter following, or hath had formerly episcopal consecration or ordination" in other words. And can any thing be plainer? The ministers of the Church of England must be episcopally ordained; but no opinion is given or doctrine taught respecting the invalidity of the orders of non-episcopal churches. (See the twenty-third article of our church.) Mr. D. goes on to say: "and therefore those denominations whose ministers are not ordained by bishops cannot have the sacraments ministered according to Christ's ordinance, and consequently are not—according to the articles of the Church of England—visible churches of Christ." Turn to Mr. Darling's letter and read this tissue of nonsense carefully, for which, by the bye, if done by a boy over twelve years old at any public school, he would run the risk of a severe flogging; then read, my friends, the nineteenth, twenty-third, thirty-fourth and thirty-sixth Articles; and then pass an honest and unbiassed judgment, whether such unchristian opinions are the doctrines of the Church of England. She says, at the conclusion of the thirty-fourth article, "Every particular or national church hath authority to ordain, change and abolish, ceremonies or rites of the church, ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying." Mr. Darling will not surely now tell us, with this article before our eyes, that episcopacy, however desirable and in accordance with primitive and universal custom, is essential to the validity of a church.

Another inaccurate quotation, so inaccurate as entirely to alter its original meaning, is in the upper part of the third page of the Pastoral Letter, where Mr. Darling asks, "Again, how did it happen that, 250 years ago, such a canon as this was passed by the synod or convocation of the Church of England? "Whosoever shall hereafter affirm or maintain that there are within this realm other meetings, assemblies, or congregations of the king's born subjects, that may rightly challenge to themselves the name of true and lawful churches, let him be excommunicated; and not restored but by the archbishop, after his repentance and public revocation of such his wicked errors." Now, my friends, Mr. Darling asserts this to be the eleventh canon of 1603, and urges you to examine and judge for yourselves. I entreat you to do this. Respond to that gentleman's invitation. For, remember, this is not any mere doctrinal argument between Mr. Darling and myself, it is much more; it is between truth and falsehood, between the bible and the deceitful crafty system of Ignatius Loyola, between the commandments of God and the traditions of men, between Protestantism and Popery. Now, let us read this eleventh canon (having obtained the churchwarden's permission, which seems first of all to be necessary by the Pastoral Letter), and we shall find it runs thus: "Whosoever shall hereafter affirm or maintain that there are within this realm other meetings, assemblies, or congregations of the king's born subjects, *than such as by the laws of this land are held and allowed*, which may rightly challenge to themselves the name of true and lawful churches; let him be excommunicated, and not restored but by the archbishop, after his repentance and public revocation of such his wicked errors." Notice well the words Mr. Darling has omitted; for, as you see, they entirely alter the meaning intended to be given you. The laws of England hold and allow the Roman Catholic to be a lawful church, by the annual grant to Maynooth alone. The laws of England hold and allow the Presbyterians, Baptists, and Independents, to be true and lawful churches, by the *regium donum*, and the annual grant of ministers' money, as it is called. Consequently, I am fully borne out by this canon of the Church of England in recognizing my Protestant brethren as belonging to this or that church.

"Another church (Popish) principle is, that there are three different orders of ministers in the church, and that they must be ordained by bishops deriving their authority by unbroken succession from the apostles." (Pastoral Letter, page 3.) Now, except the declaration that the Church of England recognizes bishops, priests, and deacons, Mr. Darling has not in his letter adduced, neither can he adduce (as he well knows) one single proof from the articles, or liturgy, much less from the bible, to support the doctrine of individual apostolical succession.

"But," says Mr. Norris, "the apostolical succession is a mere figment." Mr. Norris says no such thing; he says, in page 22 of his letter, "*individual* apostolical succession is a figment." But he holds and maintains the doctrine of the apostolical succession of the christian ministry *generally*, as a truth in accordance with scripture, and likewise acknowledged by the Church of England. But let us beware, my friends, of "setting the church and her ministers in the

place of Christ, the head of the church, and of substituting the *means* of grace for the *spirit* of grace."

At the upper part of page 4 of the Pastoral Letter occurs another false quotation. The preface to the ordination service is made to say that, "It is evident unto all men diligently reading holy scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's church; bishops, priests, and deacons." "And no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful bishop, priest, or deacon, except he hath had episcopal consecration or ordination." Now turn, my friends, to the preface in question, and you will find it says: "And no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful bishop, priest, or deacon, *in the United Church of England and Ireland*, or suffered to execute any of the said functions, except, &c., he hath had episcopal ordination." What a wide difference is here. Mr. Darling makes the church to say, no man shall be accounted a lawful bishop, priest, or deacon, unless episcopally ordained; but the church says no such thing, as you yourselves see. She only says they shall not be accounted bishops, priests, or deacons of the Church of England. "O, popery! how dost thou change men; thou destroyest humanity in the most humane, and conscience in the once most conscientious."

I have neither time nor inclination to wade through such a mass of inaccuracies and misrepresentations. Can Mr. Darling be so far on the road to Rome as to believe the end justifies the means? and therefore, if he can only make you think his teaching is in accordance with the church, your suspicions will be lulled, and your fears assuaged; and that by little and little you may be led from the simple doctrine of a crucified Saviour to embrace the whole system of popery. I hope not, but I must warn you to beware; trust not assertion, test every doctrine by the word of God. Think what Cranmer, Ridley, Hooper, Latimer, and others of that noble army of martyrs, suffered for our sakes; how they laboured that the truth might be ours. Will you, my dear friends, have the traditions of men, in however modified a form, your rule of faith; or the bible? What is the doctrine of the sacrament of the Lord's supper, as explained in the Pastoral Letter, but a refined transubstantiation? What is the doctrine of the baptismal regeneration of infants, but making that sacrament, instead of *faith*, the chief means of salvation? What is the doctrine of individual apostolical succession, but leading you to think of the creature more than the creator; to man, instead of to God? What is the definition of the Church as therein asserted, but leading men from the inward spiritual life, to place dependence on outward forms, rites and ceremonies? Cast away such human superadditions, which generate a spirit of bondage and a subjection to the rudiments of this world, and believe, with St. Paul, that "By grace ye are saved through faith, and that not of yourselves, for it is the gift of God." O, weaken not the grand doctrine of Christianity, the corner stone of the Reformation, namely, the grace of God in our justification by the alone merits of Jesus Christ, by any traditions of men. Allow not for one moment the bible to be taken from you [read the sixth article of our church], and the pretended teaching of this or that uninspired composition to take its place. The Church of England's rule of faith is the bible, the whole bible, and nothing but the bible. This, blessed be God, is the

ark to protect us from the deep waters of unbelief; this is a lantern unto our feet, and a light unto our path; this is our rock and sure tower of defence against the craft and subtlety of those lying in wait to deceive.

But it has ever been the endeavour of the Church of Rome to seek to beguile our people of their common sense. Bishop Stillingfleet [Unreasonableness of Separation, preface, p. 19] quotes a letter of advice given a Romish agent, as to the best way of managing the papal interest in England, the third head of which is "To make it appear underhand, how near the doctrine, worship and discipline, of the Church of England comes to us (of Rome); at how little distance her common prayer is from our mass; and that the wisest and ablest men of that way (the Anglican) are so moderate, that they would willingly come over to us, or at least meet us half way."

It is distressing to resume my remarks on the pastoral letter before us, but duty compels me to do so; they shall however be very brief. Mr. Darling in page 5, says, he "can shew any of you who will take the trouble to call upon him such passages from the works of Cranmer, Latimer, and others of the Reformers as will abundantly satisfy you that *they held* the doctrine of *baptismal regeneration*." Now this is simply an evasion, Mr. D. must know that I, as stated in my letter following Holy Scripture, do so in its fullest sense, but the question is will he shew us in the Reformers later writings, after their minds were fully emancipated, from the Popish thralldom in which they had been born and educated, for they were frail fallible men, groping their way at first in darkness, struggling against feelings, prejudices and associations that had grown with their growth and increased with their strength, even after light had been vouchsafed to them, sometimes halting between two opinions, and sometimes of course erring in judgment, our only wonder is that they did so much, but the hand of God was with them, teaching, strengthening and supporting them—will however Mr. Darling shew us in the Reformers later writings their belief in the doctrine of *INFANT baptismal regeneration*, he can no more do so than he could shew it you in the Bible. Remember what I said in my letter about the meaning of the word *regeneration*, the meaning attached to it by the writer of the pastoral letter is not distinctly stated, but I should suppose from what he incidentally remarks that he means renovation of heart and holiness of life—if so what becomes of the doctrine of justification by faith?

With respect to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper Mr. Darling argues both for its reality and spirituality—if it be real it cannot be spiritual, and if it be spiritual it cannot be real—there is no mean between carnality and spirituality, between transubstantiation and the simple bread and wine, at least it is beyond my limited reasoning powers to understand it. I know it is a blessed means of grace, I know my heavenly Master commands me to eat the bread and drink of the cup, in remembrance of his body broken and of his blood shed, and I do so in testimony of my belief in the fullness of that atonement which he made for me on Calvary's cross. But, my friends, our church speaks of the sacraments as seals and pledges, not as instruments of salvation in a justifying sense—as eminent means of grace, inasmuch as "faith is confirmed and grace increased" (Art. xxviii)—as that they "be not only badges or tokens of Christian

men's profession, but rather sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace." (Art. xxv.) "Not" to use the language of the Bishop of Winchester "as if they were the only sources of divine grace, to the exclusion of any other; *the means, the keys of the kingdom, and investing them with a saving intrinsic efficacy, not distinguishable by ordinary understandings from the opus operatum.*" (Charge 1841.) Again "If it be intended to convey an impression that any alteration whatever takes place in the *natural substance* of the bread and wine, or that the body and blood of Christ are present, or can be received by communicants except in a spiritual sense, such an impression we conceive to be erroneous for 'the body of Christ is given, taken and eaten, in the supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner' (Art. xxviii.) and so far dangerous, as necessarily leading to the doctrine of transubstantiation, for if once we believe any change to be effected in the natural substance of bread and wine, the main argument against transubstantiation seems to be abandoned. The same authority which is supposed capable of producing such a partial change, might be justly considered capable of producing that total change, into the very body and blood of Christ, which is held by the Roman Catholics." (Bishop of Worcester's charge, 1842.) And as our church again says: "Neither can he be devout, that otherwise doth presume, than it was given by the author. We must then take heed, lest of the MEMORY it be made a *sacrifice*; lest of a communion it be made a private eating." "Herein thou needest no other man's help, no other sacrifice or oblation, *no sacrificing priest, no mass, no means established by man's invention.*"—Homily concerning the Sacrament.

With respect to the surplice, it is a matter of perfect indifference whether a man preaches in a black, white, or any other colored gown, or no gown at all, but my objection to its use in the pulpit is this, it is the mark or symbol of a certain party in the Church whose sympathies to say the least are towards Rome. Most of you my friends never saw a clergyman preach in his surplice before the last twenty years; it was occasionally used in some of the cathedral churches, but never in parish churches, it is an innovation and Mr. Darling must well know it is. The church commands the surplice to be worn *only* when "the minister is saying the *public prayers, or ministering the sacraments* or other *rites of the church*" and at *no other time.*

The practice of turning from the people is the remains of a Jewish superstition, afterward embraced by the Romanists and Mahomedans, it is superstitious and childish in its origin, and rude and illmannered in its practice, displaying at the same time a weak and trifling mind.

At the top of page 8 Mr. Darling says, "We all I suppose, think that the chancel is worthy of more respect than other parts of the church, seeing there the highest and holiest mystery of our faith is regularly celebrated."

It perplexes me to find out why the chancel should be holier than any other part of the church, especially the porch, for in the latter in the old churches usually stood the font for baptism. At all events, if there be any holiness about the matter the place wherever the font is situated, must be as holy as where the communion table is placed, for certainly neither the Church of England nor the Bible draws any distinction between the importance of the two sacraments. The church asserts their equality clearly and without hesitation.

At page 9 of the pastoral letter Mr. Darling says, that when I was your minister, for such I suppose he means by the word "Parson," such word being wholly inapplicable in this country, "I taught these doctrines and upheld these practices." Can anything be more untrue. I as you well know did not use the surplice in the pulpit, I did not turn my back to you in any part of the liturgy, I never taught baptismal regeneration, I never taught *individual* Apostolical Succession, and this Mr. Darling must know, as soon after his taking charge of the congregation several seceded from the church solely on account of these very practices and doctrines being introduced, and considered by them unscriptural novelties.

Mr. Darling would throw discredit upon my estimation of the number of perverts to the Church of Rome; I am confident I am far under the mark. The *Baltimore Catholic Mirror* recently published the names of one hundred and eighty-five English clergymen who have fallen away since 1842. I have also a list of over two hundred graduates of Oxford and Cambridge who have seceded; and when we remember the lay perversions at Rugby, Manchester, Glasgow, London and other towns were reckoned by hundreds in each place, add to these the perversions lay and clerical in the United States and elsewhere, I am very sure the number will far exceed five thousand.

Mr. Darling doubts whether the average income of a Colonial Bishop is £2000 sterling a year. The Bishop of Calcutta receives £5000, Jamaica, Madras, and Bombay £4000 each. Sydney, Barbadoes, Antigua and the Leeward Islands £2,500 each. Indeed there are only two bishops, namely, Ruperts Land and Sierra Leone who nominally receive but £600, but this is nearly doubled by each holding a Government Colonial Chaplaincy at the same time—to these incomes allowances to a considerable amount are to be added.

At the bottom of page 11 of the pastoral, Mr. Darling repeats again a false quotation from my "letter to the Protestants of Canada," because I therein state my conviction that "the doctrines (or articles) and formularies are *upon the whole* Scriptural and admirably adapted to the wants and feelings of mankind." And I deliberately repeat in my opinion they are; but mind, Mr. Darling in quoting my words always omits one important reservation namely, "*taken as a whole.*" How this can happen so frequently I cannot say, it certainly must be done designedly or through gross carelessness, in either case it shews that little dependence can be placed upon the extracts he produces from other authorities. Because I consider there are objectionable words and phrases in the prayer book which I should gladly see remedied, and they are but few, but still they disfigure that noble compilation, and are a source of much misunderstanding and sometimes contention, am I for thus thinking to be considered an enemy of my church and order—far from it—Mr. Darling knows well that many of the most eminent divines of the Church of England have wished these things amended, but difficulties have always stood in the way, which it is to be hoped before long will be removed by the church enjoying synodal action.

In conclusion I can only express my regret that any controversy should have arisen between Mr. Darling and myself, but I cannot allow him to declare that he "teaches honestly and truly what the

Church of England holds to be true." If his teaching is in accordance with the doctrines and practices defended by him in his letter he has no business to remain a single day longer a member of the Church of England; he has nothing in common with her, for where will he find the doctrine of *individual Apostolical Succession* in the articles or prayer book? Where will he find the real presence in the sacrament of the Lord's supper? Where will he find his definition of the Church? Where will he find directions to turn from the people? Where to wear the surplice in the pulpit? Where the peculiar holiness of the chancel? Search these things my friends like the noble Bereans of old, and see if they be so. All these doctrines and practices are held and practised by the Church of Rome but not by the Church of England. Indeed to use the words of that great and good man the present bishop of Calcutta, "The attempt to set up Catholic tradition, and the teaching of the Church, as the joint rule of faith, *directly tends to bring in, what the Apostle terms, another Gospel.*" (Galatians 1. 6.)

"A fearful charge this, and which I am persuaded the leaders in this new way *are far from designing*; but which appears to me, from an attentive perusal of their writings, to be the inevitable result of the course they are pursuing."

"The whole hangs together—it institutes another gospel—it makes man his own Saviour—it repeats the very errors of the Galatian churches, which drew forth St. Paul's awful denunciations—it overturns the grand peculiarity and centre tenet of all the reformed churches—it is a covenant of works, not a salvation by grace through faith—it is a sort of mitigated law, in which sincerity, good intentions, and imperfect works, done through grace, are accepted, by virtue of Christ's merits, in the place of perfect obedience."

"Nor is it difficult to trace the steps of the process in their minds. When once we get into a false way, we are never safe one moment. The Spirit of God is grieved, and leaves us to an infatuated understanding; and there is nothing which man may not then embrace and defend. So it is here."

"I. The traditions of men having gone on working, as I have previously described, till they brought in a detrimental religion; the descent to *another gospel* was gradual and not easily observed. It sprang naturally from the darkness of the human mind and an increasing neglect of the one inspired rule of faith—the bible—the inevitable result of the whole scheme."

"II. The settlement of our church at the blessed Reformation would not long stand in the way. A perverted taste soon learned to undervalue the Reformers, to disown the name of Protestant, and to allow a preference for the imperfectly purified formularies of Henry VIII. All this has accordingly been done, and done openly."

"III. Charitable concessions to the apostate Church of Rome followed; and as many as possible of her tenets and practices were commended and restored, notwithstanding that our Reformers had swept them away as fond and superstitious."

"IV. The result, as to the charitable and affectionate regard which our first Reformers entertained for *their sister churches on the continent*, may be anticipated. Rome, and not the Reformed Churches, is the object of veneration. Episcopacy is accounted, in the teeth of our

articles (nineteenth and twenty-second), to be absolutely, and under all circumstances, essential to the very existence of a church, and the validity of the sacraments. A great stress is laid upon a visible and unbroken material succession to the *apostolic office*, on which kind of succession our articles *are silent*; whilst succession to the *apostolic doctrines*, on which doctrines they largely insist, is taken for granted, without proof, to be uniformly maintained. It follows that all the Reformed Churches and communities of Christians, *though embraced*, and intended to be embraced within the limits of the articles to which I have alluded; yet if, from whatever causes, they have not retained the exact episcopal polity, are treated not with the consideration of our great Reformers, but in the exclusive and condemnatory temper of a later age: Charity and the communion of the saints are thus as much violated, as the fundamental truths and simple worship and order of the gospel of Christ."

"V. One obstacle remained: our noble thirty-nine articles of religion, drawn up on purpose to oppose and condemn the chief errors in doctrine and practice of the Romish Church. Portentous as is the fact, they have been openly assailed by one of the most dishonorable efforts of sophistry which, I must say, has ever been witnessed in theological discussions; and which forms a melancholy proof of what a learned and earnest and able writer is capable, when under the baneful influence of a theory." (Ordination Sermon, 1841.)

This is a long extract, but I cannot forbear inserting it; and when I assure you the present Archbishops of Canterbury, York and Armagh, with the Bishops of Manchester, Hereford, and many others, use language precisely to the same effect, I leave it with you, my friends, to think whether I or Mr. Darling, to use his words at page 9 of the Pastoral Letter, "have counted so largely upon what he must suppose your ignorance, that he would persuade you that these *are* the doctrines and practices of the Church of England." We have here a fearful and melancholy proof how false doctrines and the desire to support a favorite theory will lead a man astray. Never, I assure you, and you have the means to judge for yourselves, has it been my lot to review a document so full of erroneous statements and garbled quotations; but I wish to say as little as possible on the subject—it is too painful. The prayer book is in the hands of you all; judge prayerfully, calmly and dispassionately.

It is not my intention to notice any further attacks on my pamphlet; but, if Mr. Darling, or any other person properly qualified, shall desire it, I am willing to meet such person in public discussion in any part of Upper Canada, for one or more days, to prove—*First*, That the doctrines and practices mentioned by Mr. Darling are not those of the Church of England,—*Secondly*, That they are all maintained by the Church of Rome,—and *Thirdly*, That they receive no support from the bible, but are all opposed to it.

I deeply regret to say that in my opinion Mr. Darling is one of the number of those "rash teachers who seem to think it enough, here and there to protest against certain popish corruptions; but they love to lead their disciples to the very confines of that treacherous ground—fellowship with Rome—they encourage a taste and liking for the prospect—they study to make its boundaries less distinct and perceptible, and they seem intent upon smoothing the way and affording facilities

for passing on from our own side to the other. If this be not dangerous to the purity of our church, and of the faith which has been established among us by the blood of martyrs, it is hard to say what is ; and if it be reconcilable with that allegiance to which all her ministers have over and over pledged themselves, then have we cleansed our sanctuary in vain." Bishop of Landaff's charge 1842. But my friends I hope *we* have not so learned Christ. "The whole history of the church, in every age, tends to prove the utter inefficiency of a ministry which is not faithful in honouring the Saviour by a full exhibition of his grace and love, in pointing to the light which beams from the cross, and in proclaiming openly, 'Behold the Lamb of God.' The experiment has been often tried. It has been tried upon individuals ; it has been tried upon parishes ; it has been tried upon whole countries ; and many a conscientious pen has been constrained to write the record of its utter failure." Bishop of Winchester's charge, 1841. Applying indeed the language of the celebrated Junius when speaking of our political rights, to our present subject : "We owe it to our ancestors, to preserve entire those rights, which they have delivered to our care. We owe it to our posterity, not to suffer their dearest inheritance to be destroyed. But if it were possible for us to be insensible to these sacred claims, there is yet an obligation binding upon ourselves, from which nothing can acquit us ; a personal interest which we cannot surrender. To alienate even our own rights would be a crime—but if life be the bounty of heaven, we scornfully reject the noblest part of the gift, if we consent to surrender, that certain rule of living, without which the condition of human nature, is not only miserable but contemptible."

Let us, (then) my dear friends, "stand fast in one spirit, with one mind," striving for the faith of the gospel. It is only by such union that we can reasonably hope to "put to silence the ignorance of foolish men." When will we forget to "strive about words to no profit, but to the subverting of the hearers." When will we forget to enter upon "foolish questions which, as of old, do but gender strifes." Let us strive to "hold the faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life." "Dwell not upon the external and ritual parts of our religious service, and lose sight of their inner meaning and spiritual life; deface not the brightest glory of the church, by forgetting the continual presence of her Lord;" substitute not for the worship in spirit and in truth, the observance of "days and months, and times and years"—for the freedom of the gospel, a spirit of bondage—for the ways of pleasantness and the peace which passeth all understanding, the valley of Baca and a body of death. Let your christianity be a living active principle, looking alone to the author and finisher of your faith, "for the Lord God is a sun and shield, and no good thing will he withhold from them that walk uprightly;" till, having finished your course with joy, "an abundant entrance may be ministered unto you, into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."

Believe me, my dear friends,

Yours faithfully,

W. H. NORRIS.

Scarboro', May 14th, 1853.

t dan-
been
what
min-
an-
ut my
ory of
7 of a
exhi-
beams
God?
ndiv-
whole
ed to
large,
when
owe it
e deli-
their
us to
nding
terest
would
reject
n rule
t only

th one
n that
men."
to the
upon
Let us
e, and
ritual
eaning
ch, by
for the
months,
bond-
eth all
your
author
d, and
;" till,
may be
rd and

RIS.